

Precision Electroweak Tests of the Minimal and Flipped $SU(5)$ Supergravity Models

JORGE L. LOPEZ, D. V. NANOPOULOS, GYE T. PARK, H. POIS, and KAJIA YUAN

*Center for Theoretical Physics, Department of Physics, Texas A&M University
College Station, TX 77843-4242, USA*

and

*Astroparticle Physics Group, Houston Advanced Research Center (HARC)
The Woodlands, TX 77381, USA*

ABSTRACT

We explore the one-loop electroweak radiative corrections in the minimal $SU(5)$ and the no-scale flipped $SU(5)$ supergravity models via explicit calculation of vacuum polarization contributions to the $\epsilon_{1,2,3}$ parameters. Experimentally, $\epsilon_{1,2,3}$ are obtained from a global fit to the LEP observables, and M_W/M_Z measurements. We include q^2 -dependent effects which have been neglected in most previous “model-independent” analyses of this type. These effects induce a large systematic negative shift on $\epsilon_{1,2,3}$ for light chargino masses ($m_{\chi_1^\pm} \lesssim 70$ GeV). In agreement with previous general arguments, we find that for increasingly large sparticle masses, the heavy sector of both models rapidly decouples, *i.e.*, the values for $\epsilon_{1,2,3}$ quickly asymptote to the Standard Model values with a *light* Higgs ($m_{H_{SM}} \sim 100$ GeV). Specifically, at present the 90% CL upper limit on the top-quark mass is $m_t \lesssim 175$ GeV in the no-scale flipped $SU(5)$ supergravity model. These bounds can be strengthened for increasing chargino masses in the 50 – 100 GeV interval. In particular, for $m_t \gtrsim 160$ GeV, the Tevatron may be able to probe through gluino($\tilde{g}$) and squark($\tilde{q}$) production up to $m_{\tilde{g}} \approx m_{\tilde{q}} \approx 250$ GeV, exploring at least half of the parameter space in this model.

April, 1993

1. Introduction

Despite the lack of a single *direct* piece of experimental evidence for any supersymmetric partner to the Standard Model (SM) particles, there are some remarkable *indirect* results which indicate that superpartners may be operative at the $\mathcal{O}(1\text{ TeV})$ scale, and involve several predictions and constraints which could be regarded as much more than coincidence. The most dramatic one is the high-precision unification of the running gauge couplings at superhigh energies in the minimal $SU(5)$ supergravity model, only when virtual sparticle effects intervene at the TeV scale and modify the running of the gauge couplings [1]. Virtual supersymmetric effects have long been known to be a possible menace to supersymmetric models because of the potentially large one-loop induced flavor-changing-neutral-current (FCNC) processes such as $K - \bar{K}$ mixing and CP violation in the K system [2], requiring high degeneracy of squark masses. Supergravity models with universal soft-supersymmetry breaking naturally tame these effects [3]. More recently, one-loop supersymmetric contributions to FCNC process $b \rightarrow s\gamma$ have been shown to be a possible deep probe of supersymmetric models [4].

In this work we explore yet another avenue for experimentally testable virtual effects in supergravity models, namely one-loop electroweak (EW) radiative corrections. In particular, we explore the minimal $SU(5)$ [5] and the no-scale flipped $SU(5)$ supergravity models [6] which can be considered to be prototype traditional versus string-inspired supergravity models. This work represents a continuation of a general program which we have initiated in the study of supergravity models. Previously, we have explored the broader issues of EW radiative symmetry breaking, and bounds on the parameter space of supergravity models resulting from the many experimental and consistency constraints [7]. More recently, we have included the stringent constraints from proton decay and the cosmological neutralino relic density, applicable to the minimal $SU(5)$ model we consider here [8,9]. Finally, we have explored chargino-neutralino production and detection at Fermilab [11], chargino, neutralino, slepton, and Higgs production and detection at LEP II [12], and selectron-neutralino and sneutrino-chargino production and detection at HERA [13]. Here, we present a complete study of one-loop EW radiative corrections in the minimal and flipped $SU(5)$ supergravity models, incorporating the most recent global fits to the precision measurements from LEP.

Several previous studies of EW radiative corrections in the generic minimal supersymmetric standard model (MSSM) and supergravity models exist [14,15,16,17,18,19]. In

many cases however, the emphases were different and the contributions of q^2 -dependent effects have often been neglected under the assumption that they are unimportant, as would be the case for $m_{susy} > M_Z$. In the MSSM however, it has been recently demonstrated that for very light charginos ($m_{\chi^\pm} \lesssim 60 - 70 \text{ GeV}$), a significant Z -boson wave-function renormalization threshold effect can modify the results dramatically [18]. In the models we consider here, this effect leads to strong correlations between the chargino and the top-quark mass. Specifically, we find that at present the 90% CL upper limit on the top-quark mass is $m_t \lesssim 175 \text{ GeV}$ in the no-scale flipped $SU(5)$ supergravity model. These bounds can be strengthened for increasing chargino masses in the $50 - 100 \text{ GeV}$ interval. For example, in the flipped model for $m_{\chi_1^\pm} \gtrsim 60 (70) \text{ GeV}$, we find $m_t \lesssim 165 (160) \text{ GeV}$. As expected, the heavy sector of both models decouples quite rapidly with increasing sparticle masses, and at present, only ϵ_1 leads to constraints on the parameter spaces of these models. However, as we discuss, future values for ϵ_2, ϵ_3 may also be constraining. Finally, an upper limit to m_t leads to upper limits to the lightest CP-even Higgs boson mass (m_h) which may be within reach of LEP II.

In the following section, we briefly discuss the overall motivation and structure of the minimal and flipped $SU(5)$ models that we study here. In Sec. 3, we present an overview of EW radiative corrections, and justify our use of the $\epsilon_{1,2,3}$ parameterization. In Sec. 4 we discuss the specific minimal and flipped $SU(5)$ supergravity model contributions to the vacuum polarization diagrams, and the resultant contributions to the $\epsilon_{1,2,3}$, and finally conclude in Section 5.

2. The minimal and flipped $SU(5)$ supergravity models

The minimal [5] and no-scale flipped [6] $SU(5)$ supergravity models that we consider here can be regarded as prototypes for realistic traditional versus string-inspired supergravity unified models. At low energy, both contain (i) the SM $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ gauge symmetry which is radiatively broken at the weak scale, and (ii) the three SM generations and two Higgs doublets of matter representations at the EW scale (along with their superpartners). There are however, several crucial differences between the two models: (i) each unifies into a larger (but different) gauge group, namely $SU(5)$ versus $SU(5) \times U(1)$, (ii) the unification scale in the minimal $SU(5)$ model is $M_U \approx 10^{16} \text{ GeV}$, whereas in the flipped case, the (string) unification scale is $M_U \approx 10^{18} \text{ GeV}$, close to the Planck scale.

Unification at this higher scale is due to the effects of additional, vector-like representations $(Q, \overline{Q}, D, \overline{D})$ that naturally fit into the $\mathbf{10}, \overline{\mathbf{10}}$ flipped $SU(5)$ representations. At the unification scale the heavy field content is also quite different, and leads to different conclusions regarding proton decay: in the minimal $SU(5)$ model proton decay is highly constraining [20,9,10], whereas in the flipped model it is not. Finally, (iii) the pattern of soft-supersymmetry breaking at the unification scale is quite different: in the flipped case, the sole source of SUSY breaking is due to a universal gaugino mass ($m_{1/2}$) as is typical in unified no-scale supergravity models [21], whereas in the minimal $SU(5)$ model, universal scalar (m_0) and trilinear (A) contributions must also be included.

The constraints of gauge and Yukawa unification along with the SUSY breaking assumptions and the satisfaction of all the consistency and phenomenological constraints on these models lead to a restricted five-dimensional parameter space in this class of models [7]. Besides the three SUSY breaking parameters ($m_{1/2}, \xi_0 \equiv m_0/m_{1/2}, \xi_A \equiv A/m_{1/2}$; $\xi_0 = \xi_A = 0$ in the flipped model) one also has the top-quark mass (m_t), and the ratio of Higgs vacuum expectation values ($\tan\beta = v_2/v_1$) defined at the EW scale. The sign of the superpotential Higgs mixing term μ is also undetermined, and both cases ($\pm|\mu|$) must be considered. Primarily as a result of the quite different pattern of SUSY breaking, the low-energy predictions for the squark, slepton, chargino and neutralino mass spectra are quite distinct, and lead to strikingly different phenomenology in the two models (see Refs. [8,9,10,11,12,13,22] for detailed discussions).

As described in detail in Ref. [7], our strategy for studying these models involves a discrete sampling of the $(m_{1/2}, \xi_0, \xi_A, \tan\beta, m_t)$ parameter space over their allowed domain. Several consistency and phenomenological constraints restrict the range of the model parameters and yield an allowed region in parameter space. See Refs. [10] and [6] for the determination of the parameter spaces in the minimal and flipped $SU(5)$ supergravity models respectively. In the remainder of this work we explore the constraints arising from one-loop EW radiative corrections.

3. One-loop EW radiative corrections and the $\epsilon_{1,2,3}$ parameters

It is now well known that quantum effects in the EW sector lead to significant, measurable corrections to the various tree-level EW parameters which are otherwise in discrepancy with the data by more than 2σ . For example, predictions for $\sin^2\theta_w$ and M_W which are

obtained from various Z -scale measurements and low-energy neutrino scattering experiments are consistent only if one-loop effects are considered. In the SM (assuming a single Higgs doublet to effect the EW symmetry breaking), there is a residual $SU_V(2)$ (custodial) symmetry which protects the tree-level relation $\rho \equiv M_Z^2 \cos^2 \theta_w / M_W^2 = 1$. This symmetry is broken at the loop level by unequal top- and bottom-quark Yukawa couplings and hypercharge interactions (or equivalently $\sin^2 \theta_w \neq 0$) leading to the well known quadratic m_t and logarithmic $m_{H_{SM}}$ dependences of $\delta\rho$.¹ These effects typically do not decouple with increasingly larger mass scales. Global SM fits to all of the low-energy and electroweak data therefore constrain $m_t < 194, 178, 165$ GeV for $m_{H_{SM}} = 1000, 250, 50$ GeV at the 90% CL respectively [23].

Recently, several schemes have been introduced which effectively parametrize the EW vacuum polarization corrections [24,25,26,27]. One can easily show that an expansion of the vacuum polarization tensors to order q^2 , results in three independent physical parameters. Alternatively, one can show from an effective field theory point of view, that there are three additional terms in the lagrangian [26]. In the (S, T, U) scheme [25], a SM reference value for $m_t, m_{H_{SM}}$ is used, and the deviation from this reference is calculated and is considered to be “new” physics. This scheme is only valid to lowest order in q^2 , and is therefore not applicable to a theory with new, light ($\sim M_Z$) particles. In the two supergravity models we explore here, each point in parameter space is actually a distinct model, and a SM reference point is not meaningful. For these reasons, we choose to use the scheme of Refs. [27,28,18] where the contributions are *absolute* and valid to higher order in q^2 . This $\epsilon_{1,2,3}$ scheme is therefore more applicable to a global fit of the supergravity models we consider here. Regardless of the scheme used, all of the global fits to the three physical parameters are *entirely consistent* with the SM at 90% CL.

In principle, every observable, such as the Z widths into a pair of fermions (Γ_f , $f = l, b$), the forward-backward asymmetries at the Z -pole (A_{FB}^f , $f = l, b$), the τ -polarization asymmetry (A_{Pol}^τ), the ratio of neutral- to charged-current processes in deep-inelastic neutrino scattering on nuclei (R_ν), etc., is a distinct measurable and is not directly related to the others. Various assumptions need to be made in order to combine these measurements in a way which is predictive and sensitive to new physics effects. The first assumption usually made is quark-lepton universality. Secondly, the dominant “new” contributions

¹ Supersymmetry breaking effects introduce new sources of explicit $SU(2)_V$ breaking, and so does $\tan\beta \neq 1$. See Ref. [17] for a detailed discussion of this point.

are assumed to arise from the process-independent (*i.e.*, “oblique”) vacuum polarization amplitudes. In fact, even if there are non-negligible non-oblique (*i.e.*, vertex and box diagrams) corrections, the set of observables can be restricted such that these contributions are minimized. Such is the case of the vertex corrections to the Z - $b\bar{b}$ coupling which are important in supersymmetric models but their impact is minimized by considering A_{FB}^b where these mainly cancel out [29]. It follows that the Γ_b observable should not be included if the vacuum-polarization dominance assumption is to hold.² The above assumptions allow for a large set of measurables to be combined into a global fit.

In the $\epsilon_{1,2,3}$ scheme these parameters³ can be written as follows [18,29],

$$\epsilon_1 = e_1 - e_5 - \frac{\delta G_{V,B}}{G} - 4\delta g_A, \quad (3.1a)$$

$$\epsilon_2 = e_2 - s^2 e_4 - c^2 e_5 - \frac{\delta G_{V,B}}{G} - \delta g_V - 3\delta g_A, \quad (3.1b)$$

$$\epsilon_3 = e_3 + c^2 e_4 - c^2 e_5 + \frac{c^2 - s^2}{2s^2} \delta g_V - \frac{1 + 2s^2}{2s^2} \delta g_A, \quad (3.1c)$$

where $s^2 = 1 - c^2 = \sin^2 \theta_W$ and the e_i , ($i = 1 \rightarrow 5$) are the following combinations of the vacuum polarization amplitudes

$$e_1 = \frac{\alpha}{4\pi s^2 M_W^2} [\Pi_T^{33}(0) - \Pi_T^{11}(0)], \quad (3.2a)$$

$$e_2 = F_{WW}(M_W^2) - \frac{\alpha}{4\pi s^2} F_{33}(M_Z^2), \quad (3.2b)$$

$$e_3 = \frac{\alpha}{4\pi s^2} [F_{3Q}(M_Z^2) - F_{33}(M_Z^2)], \quad (3.2c)$$

$$e_4 = F_{\gamma\gamma}(0) - F_{\gamma\gamma}(M_Z^2), \quad (3.2d)$$

$$e_5 = M_Z^2 F'_{ZZ}(M_Z^2), \quad (3.2e)$$

and the $q^2 \neq 0$ contributions $F_{ij}(q^2)$ are defined by

$$\Pi_T^{ij}(q^2) = \Pi_T^{ij}(0) + q^2 F_{ij}(q^2). \quad (3.3)$$

² Low-energy measurements such as R_ν and the weak charge Q_W measured in atomic parity violation in cesium are not included since non-oblique supersymmetric corrections down to low-energies may be quite important in the presence of a light chargino.

³ In our calculations, we use $\overline{MS}$ scheme [30] throughout, where one has an advantage of having some expressions simpler than in the on-shell scheme [31].

The $\delta g_{V,A}$ in Eqns. (3.1a – c) are the contributions to the vector and axial-vector form factors at $q^2 = M_Z^2$ in the $Z \rightarrow l^+ l^-$ vertex from proper vertex diagrams and fermion self-energies, and $\delta G_{V,B}$ in Eqns. (3.1a, b) comes from the one-loop box, vertex and fermion self-energy corrections to the μ -decay amplitude at zero external momentum. It is important to note that these non-oblique SM corrections are non-negligible, and must be included in order to obtain an accurate SM prediction. Our method consists of making a graphical fit to the SM curves in Ref. [18]. In the following section we calculate the vacuum polarization contributions to $\epsilon_{1,2,3}$ in the two models we consider. As discussed above, we assume throughout that the non-oblique supersymmetric contributions to the measurables that are included in the global fit are negligible.

4. Contributions from the minimal and flipped SU(5) supergravity models

It is well known in the MSSM that the largest contributions to ϵ_1 (*i.e.*, $\delta\rho$ if q^2 -dependent effects are neglected) are expected to arise from the $\tilde{t}\text{--}\tilde{b}$ sector, and in the limiting case of a very light stop, the contribution is comparable to that of the $t\text{--}b$ sector [17]. The remaining squark, slepton, chargino, neutralino, and Higgs sectors all typically contribute considerably less. For increasing sparticle masses, the heavy sector of the theory decouples, and only SM effects with a *light* Higgs survive. However, for very light chargino, we have mentioned that a Z -wavefunction renormalization threshold effect can introduce a substantial q^2 -dependence in the calculation, thus modifying significantly the standard $\delta\rho$ results. For completeness, we include the complete vacuum polarization contributions from the Higgs sector, the supersymmetric chargino-neutralino and sfermion sectors, and also the corresponding contributions in the SM. Our analytical expressions for the $\Pi_T^{ij}(q^2)$ agree with those given in Refs. [16,17] as well as other existing references [32]. For the SUSY vacuum polarization contributions, new infinities are introduced which must cancel in the full calculation of any physical, gauge invariant observable. Divergence-cancellation is thus a crucial and useful check of the masses and couplings, especially in the chargino-neutralino sector where the cancellation is not obvious. We have verified this consistency condition both analytically and numerically. Following the convention of Ref. [18], we include the running of the electric charge from $q^2 = 0$ up to $q^2 = M_Z^2$, due to light quarks and leptons, by using $\alpha(M_Z)$ in Eq. (3.2). This implies that one should use $s^2 = 0.2312$ [18,29]. Moreover, e_4 should include only contributions from the remaining charged particles, *i.e.*, from W, t , and the supersymmetric charged particles.

In Fig. 1 (2) we show the calculated values of ϵ_1 versus the lightest chargino mass ($m_{\chi_1^\pm}$) and versus the lightest CP-even Higgs boson mass (m_h), for the sampled points in the minimal (flipped) $SU(5)$ supergravity model. In Fig. 2 (the flipped case) three representative values of m_t were used, $m_t = 100, 130, 160$ GeV, whereas in Fig. 1 (the minimal $SU(5)$ case), several other values for m_t in the range $90 \text{ GeV} \leq m_t \leq 160 \text{ GeV}$ were sampled. In both models, but most clearly in the flipped model (Fig. 2) one can see how quickly the sparticle spectrum decouples as $m_{\chi_1^\pm}$ increases, and the value of ϵ_1 asymptotes to the SM value appropriate to each value of m_t and for a *light* (~ 100 GeV) Higgs mass. This result is in agreement with Ref. [22] where we have shown that the Higgs sector is SM-like for virtually all points in these models. The threshold effect of $\chi_1^\pm$ is manifest as $m_{\chi_1^\pm} \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}M_Z$ and is especially visible for $\mu < 0$ in both models. This systematic, negative contribution comes from the F' term in e_5 which is considered to be a Z -wave-function renormalization effect [18]. Note from Eq. (3.1) that all ϵ 's are affected similarly. Due to the presence of the $\chi^+ - \chi^-$ cut near M_Z the F' term is not expected to be very accurate as $m_{\chi_1^\pm} \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}M_Z$. However, according to Ref. [18], for $m_{\chi_1^\pm} > 50$ GeV, this correction agrees to better than 10% with the one obtained in a more accurate way. Our numerical results for ϵ_1 can be compared with Ref. [18] where the authors calculated ϵ_1 in the MSSM neglecting squark contributions for different choices of $m_{\chi_1^\pm}$ and assumed a common slepton mass m_S . The maximum wavefunction renormalization effect in Ref. [18] occurs at $m_{\chi_1^\pm} = m_S = 50$ GeV. Our results for the two realistic supergravity models at fixed m_t and $m_{\chi_1^\pm}$ fall between their minimum and maximum values.

Recent values for $\epsilon_{1,2,3}$ obtained from a global fit to the LEP (*i.e.*, $\Gamma_l, A_{FB}^{l,b}, A_{pol}^\tau$) and M_W/M_Z measurements are [29],

$$\epsilon_1 = (-0.9 \pm 3.7)10^{-3}, \quad \epsilon_2 = (9.9 \pm 8.0)10^{-3}, \quad \epsilon_3 = (-0.9 \pm 4.1)10^{-3}. \quad (4.1)$$

For ϵ_1 it is clear that virtually all the sampled points in the minimal $SU(5)$ supergravity model (Fig. 1) are within the $\pm 1.64\sigma$ (90% CL) bounds (denoted by the two horizontal solid lines in the figures). Since several values for $90 \leq m_t \leq 160$ GeV were sampled, the trends for fixed m_t are not very clear from the figure. Nonetheless, the points just outside the 1.64σ line correspond to $m_t = 160$ GeV, which are therefore excluded at the 90% CL. We note that we have imposed the improved experimental constraint $m_h > 60$ GeV [22], which has the effect of removing many of the points corresponding to very light $\chi_1^\pm$, particularly for $\mu > 0$. We have also imposed $m_{\chi_1^\pm} \gtrsim 50$ GeV as an accuracy cut due to the

threshold effect mentioned above. Larger values for m_t were not explored since they are not expected to be consistent with the combined proton decay and cosmological constraints in this model [9]. Thus, no useful upper bound on m_t (from ϵ_1) can be obtained in this model. However, should these two constraints be relaxed, we would expect to obtain upper bounds similar to those that follow for the flipped model below.

In the flipped model (Fig. 2), the upper bound on m_t depends sensitively on the chargino mass. For example, for $m_t = 160$ GeV, only light chargino masses would be acceptable at 90% CL. In fact, we have scanned the region $130 \text{ GeV} \leq m_t \leq 190 \text{ GeV}$ in increments of 5 GeV and obtained the maximum values for $m_{\chi_1^\pm}$ allowed by the experimental value for ϵ_1 at 90% CL. These are given in the Table I. One can immediately see the strong correlation between m_t and $m_{\chi_1^\pm}$: as m_t rises, the upper limit to $m_{\chi_1^\pm}$ falls, and vice versa. In particular, for $m_t \leq 150$ GeV all values of $m_{\chi_1^\pm}$ are allowed, while one could have m_t as large as 160 (175) GeV for $\mu > 0$ ($\mu < 0$) if the chargino mass were light enough.

Turning to the other two variables, in Figs. 3-6, one can see that both ϵ_2 and ϵ_3 do not constrain the models at the present level of experimental accuracy. Nonetheless, it is evident from the figures that both ϵ_2, ϵ_3 are also affected by the threshold effect for light $\chi_1^\pm$, since $\epsilon_{2,3}$ depend on e_5 in a similar way that ϵ_1 does (see Eq. (3.1)). The practice of plotting ϵ_1, ϵ_3 and drawing the 90% CL correlated error ellipse (see *e.g.*, Refs. [19,29]) may prove useful when ϵ_3 becomes constraining, and at present it is not.

In Figs. 3-6, the bottom row presents $\epsilon_{2,3}$ versus m_h . Since one-loop corrections to m_h depend strongly on m_t , there is an upper limit to m_h for fixed m_t . This upper limit is most apparent in the flipped case (Fig. 2) for the three choices of m_t . For $\mu > 0$, the 90% upper limit to ϵ_1 (see Fig. 2, bottom row) requires $m_h \lesssim 100$ GeV (for $m_t = 160$ GeV), whereas for $\mu < 0$ the limit is $m_h \lesssim 105$ GeV. The *absolute* upper limit to m_h would correspond to a smaller top mass ($\simeq 150$ GeV) and would be close to $m_h \sim 115$ GeV. In the minimal $SU(5)$ model (see Fig. 1, bottom row), there are at present no useful limits to m_h from ϵ_1 (*e.g.*, for $\mu < 0$, $m_h \lesssim 94$ GeV as opposed to $m_h \lesssim 97$ GeV if the ϵ_1 constraint is not imposed). For each m_t branch in Fig. 2 (bottom row) one can see the drop in ϵ_1 vs. m_h corresponding to points where $m_{\chi_1^\pm}$ is light. Since there is no Zhh coupling (due to bose symmetry), there is no threshold effect for light h Higgs masses ($m_h \simeq 60$ GeV). The apparent drop in ϵ_1 vs. m_h ($\mu < 0$) in Fig. 1 is due to the fact that m_h and $m_{\chi_1^\pm}$ are somewhat correlated (since both scale by $m_{1/2}$). The relationship between $\epsilon_{2,3}$ vs. m_h is qualitatively similar to ϵ_1 in the flipped case, except for a closer spacing between the

three sets of m_t values due to a milder m_t dependence (see bottom row in Figs. 4,6). As is well known, $\epsilon_{2,3}$ depend on the top-quark mass only as $\ln(m_t/M_Z)$, and are therefore more sensitive to new physics. This can be seen most clearly in Figs. 4,6 for $\epsilon_{2,3}$ for the flipped case, where the curves corresponding to the three m_t values are grouped very close together. However, all are well within the 90% CL experimental limits. This weak dependence on m_t makes these variables potentially good probes of new physics, especially if the top-quark is not within the reach of the Tevatron. For the future, it is expected that 2×10^6 Z-events/experiment at LEPI will lower the uncertainties for $\epsilon_{1,3}$ to $\pm 2.0 \times 10^{-3}$ [29]. Depending on the new central values, one may be able to make definitive statements about constraints on the parameter spaces of these models.

One should be careful when making statements about upper limits to m_t based on the oft-quoted global fits to the data. There is an inherent uncertainty in the fits due to the fact that the correlation matrix between the various measurables is almost always omitted from the analysis (see however Ref. [33]). Nonetheless, the general trends we find here can be expected to hold: for very light chargino mass ($m_{\chi_1^\pm}$), the top quark can be heavy ($m_t \gtrsim 160$ GeV) and thus possibly escape detection at Fermilab from the data collected during 1993-94 (assuming $\mathcal{L} = 75 \text{ pb}^{-1}$ of integrated luminosity). However, light charginos should be readily detectable at LEPII in both models [12], at the Tevatron in the minimal $SU(5)$ model [11], and at HERA in the flipped $SU(5)$ model [13]. Moreover, since $m_t \gtrsim 160$ GeV requires $m_{\chi_1^\pm} \lesssim 70$ GeV in the flipped model (see Table I), upper bounds on many other sparticle masses follow, since all scale with $m_{1/2}$. These bounds are shown in Table II. Note that with 100 pb^{-1} of integrated luminosity, the Tevatron may be able to probe up to $m_{\tilde{g}} \approx m_{\tilde{q}} \approx 250$ GeV through the missing p_T + jets signal [34]. Thus, the full gluino and squark mass range (for the $\mu > 0$) may be accessible at the Tevatron if the top quark is not seen.

5. Conclusions

In this work, we have explored the minimal $SU(5)$ and the no-scale flipped $SU(5)$ supergravity model contributions to the three physical one-loop EW correction parameters, and have compared these results to the latest global fit to the LEP precision measurements. We include the *complete* sparticle spectrum, and also include q^2 -dependent effects which are important for a light chargino spectrum. This effect is due to a Z-boson wavefunction renormalization threshold effect, and systematically lowers the values of $\epsilon_{1,2,3}$. As we have

shown, the effect is most significant for $m_{\chi_1^\pm} \lesssim 70$ GeV, where light $\chi_1^\pm$ can reduce the value for ϵ_1 to fall within the experimental limits for m_t as large as 175 GeV in the flipped model. However, this region for $\chi_1^\pm$ is quite restrictive, and should be thoroughly explored at LEP II [12]. Moreover, in this case the Tevatron should be able to explore at least half of the parameter space of the flipped model through gluino and squark production.

Conversely, if $m_{\chi_1^\pm} \gtrsim 70$ GeV and the top is not seen with $\mathcal{L} = 100 \text{ pb}^{-1}$ integrated luminosity at CDF (by early 1995), then the two models here would be disfavored (at 90% CL). Only ϵ_1 is constraining, due to an m_t^2 dependence, and the inferred upper limits to m_t correspond to SM limits with a light (~ 100 GeV) Higgs, since both models decouple quite rapidly with increasing $m_{\chi_1^\pm}$. For the future, LEP measurements may be able to reduce the errors on the ϵ_i considerably (e.g. ϵ_3 by 75%), and we may begin to constrain the models. However, if $m_{\chi_1^\pm} \gtrsim 70$ GeV, the constraints on the two models would apply equally well to the SM: if the SM is eventually ruled out by precision EW physics, then so are the two supergravity models we consider here. Considering the Higgs sector, an upper limit to m_t leads to a 90% CL upper limit $m_h \lesssim 115$ GeV in the flipped model, however the present errors do not allow for any useful constraints on m_h in the minimal model.

The future of precision EW tests of the minimal and flipped $SU(5)$ models looks quite promising. If the SM is ruled out by precision EW tests, the only “loophole” for the two supergravity models considered here would be to include a light chargino. If the tests remain consistent with the SM, then we can assume that the SUSY spectrum has decoupled, and would resemble the SM with a light Higgs, placing a more restrictive upper limit on m_t . In this case, the top quark should be seen at Fermilab in the near future. Thus, in combination with direct sparticle and top-quark searches, we may be able to unambiguously test these models in present and future experiments at Fermilab and LEP II.

Acknowledgments: This work has been supported in part by DOE grant DE-FG05-91-ER-40633. The work of J.L. has been supported by an SSC Fellowship. The work of D.V.N. has been supported in part by a grant from Conoco Inc. The work of G.P. and K.Y. has been supported by World-Laboratory Fellowships. G.P. thanks the Phenomenology Institute of the University of Wisconsin for his use of its computing facilities for this work. H.P. wishes to thank B. Lynn and J. White for several helpful discussions.

References

- [1] J. Ellis, S. Kelley and D. V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. B **249** (1990) 441, Phys. Lett. B **260** (1991) 131, Nucl. Phys. B **373** (1992) 55; P. Langacker and M.-X. Luo, Phys. Rev. D **44** (1991) 817; F. Anselmo, L. Cifarelli, A. Peterman, and A. Zichichi, Nuovo Cim. **104A** (1991) 1817 and **105A** (1992) 581.
- [2] J. Ellis and D. V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. B **110** (1982) 44.
- [3] For a recent reappraisal see *e.g.*, J. Hagelin, S. Kelley, and T. Tanaka, MIU-THP-92/59.
- [4] S. Bertolini, F. Borzumati, A. Masiero, and G. Ridolfi, Nucl. Phys. B **353** (1991) 591; V. Barger, M. Berger, and R. J. N. Phillips, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70** (1993) 1368; J. Hewett, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70** (1993) 1045; R. Barbieri and G. Giudice, CERN-TH.6830/93; J. L. Lopez, D. V. Nanopoulos, and G.T. Park, Texas A & M University preprint CTP-TAMU-16/93.
- [5] For reviews see: R. Arnowitt and P. Nath, *Applied N=1 Supergravity* (World Scientific, Singapore 1983); H. P. Nilles, Phys. Rep. **110** (1984) 1.
- [6] J. L. Lopez, D. V. Nanopoulos, and A. Zichichi, CERN-P-TH.6667/92, CTP-TAMU-68/92.
- [7] S. Kelley, J. L. Lopez, D. V. Nanopoulos, H. Pois, and K. Yuan, Texas A & M University preprint CTP-TAMU-16/92 and CERN-TH.6498/92 (to appear in Nucl. Phys. B).
- [8] J. L. Lopez, D. V. Nanopoulos, and A. Zichichi, Phys. Lett. B **291** (1992) 255.
- [9] J. L. Lopez, D. V. Nanopoulos, and H. Pois, Phys. Rev. D **47** (1993) 2468.
- [10] J. L. Lopez, D. V. Nanopoulos, H. Pois, and A. Zichichi, Phys. Lett. B **299** (1993) 262.
- [11] J. L. Lopez, D. V. Nanopoulos, X. Wang, and A. Zichichi, CERN/PPE/92-194, CTP-TAMU-76/92.
- [12] J. L. Lopez, D. V. Nanopoulos, H. Pois, X. Wang, and A. Zichichi, CERN-PPE/93-16, CTP-TAMU-89/92.
- [13] J. L. Lopez, D. V. Nanopoulos, X. Wang, and A. Zichichi, CERN-PPE/93-64, CTP-TAMU-15/93.
- [14] E. Eliasson, Phys. Lett. B **147** (1984) 67; S. Lim, *et. al.*, Phys. Rev. D **29** (1984) 1488; J. Grifols and J. Sola, Nucl. Phys. B **253** (1985) 47; B. Lynn, *et. al.*, in Physics at LEP, eds. J. Ellis and R. Peccei, CERN Yellow Report CERN86-02, Vol. 1; R. Barbieri et al., Nucl. Phys. B **341** (1990) 309.
- [15] A. Bilal, J. Ellis, and G. Fogli, Phys. Lett. B **246** (1990) 459.
- [16] M. Drees, K. Hagiwara, and A. Yamada, Phys. Rev. D **45** (1992) 1725.
- [17] M. Drees and K. Hagiwara, Phys. Rev. D **42** (1990) 1709.
- [18] R. Barbieri, M. Frigeni, and F. Caravaglios, Phys. Lett. B **279** (1992) 169.

- [19] G. Altarelli, R. Barbieri, and F. Caravaglios, CERN-TH.6770/93.
- [20] M. Matsumoto, J. Arafune, H. Tanaka, and K. Shiraishi, Phys. Rev. D **46** (1992) 3966; R. Arnowitt and P. Nath, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69** (1992) 725; P. Nath and R. Arnowitt, Phys. Lett. B **287** (1992) 89 and Phys. Lett. B **289** (1992) 368.
- [21] For a review see, A. B. Lahanas and D. V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Rep. **145** (1987) 1.
- [22] J. L. Lopez, D. V. Nanopoulos, H. Pois, X. Wang, and A. Zichichi, CERN-PPE/93-17, CTP-TAMU-05/93 (to appear in Phys. Lett. B).
- [23] Particle Data Group, Phys. Rev. D **45** (1992) S1.
- [24] D. Kennedy and B. Lynn, Nucl. Phys. B **322** (1989) 1; D. Kennedy, B. Lynn, C. Im, and R. Stuart, Nucl. Phys. B **321** (1989) 83.
- [25] M. Peskin and T. Takeuchi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65** (1990) 964; W. Marciano and J. Rosner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65** (1990) 2963; D. Kennedy and P. Langacker, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65** (1990) 2967.
- [26] B. Holdom and J. Terning, Phys. Lett. B **247** (1990) 88; M. Golden and L. Randall, Nucl. Phys. B **361** (1991) 3; A. Dobado, D. Espriu, and M. Herrero, Phys. Lett. B **255** (1991) 405.
- [27] G. Altarelli and R. Barbieri, Phys. Lett. B **253** (1990) 161.
- [28] G. Altarelli, R. Barbieri, and S. Jadach, Nucl. Phys. B **369** (1992) 3.
- [29] R. Barbieri, CERN Report No. CERN-TH.6659/92 (unpublished).
- [30] S. Sarantakos, A. Sirlin, and W. J. Marciano, Nucl. Phys. B **217** (1983) 84.
- [31] A. Sirlin, Phys. Rev. D **22** (1980) 971.
- [32] C. S. Lim, T. Inami, and N. Sakai, Phys. Rev. D **29** (1984) 1488; B. A. Kniehl, Nucl. Phys. B **352** (1991) 1.
- [33] D. Levinthal, F. Bird, R. Stuart, and B. Lynn, Z. Phys. C, **53** (1992) 617.
- [34] See, for example, V. Barger, talk presented at the HARC workshop “Recent Advances in the Superworld”, The Woodlands, Texas, April 1993.

Table I: Maximum allowed chargino mass ($m_{\chi_1^\pm}$) for different m_t (in GeV) at 90%CL in the flipped $SU(5)$ model. In the entries Y(N) means all points are within (outside) the LEP bounds at 90%CL

m_t	$\mu > 0$	$\mu < 0$
145	Y	Y
150	Y	Y
155	68	95
160	66	72
165	N	63
170	N	58
175	N	53
180	N	N

Table II: Maximum allowed particle masses (in GeV) at 90%CL for $m_t \gtrsim 160$ GeV in the flipped $SU(5)$ model.

	$\mu > 0$	$\mu < 0$
χ_1^0	35	38
$\chi_1^\pm$	66	72
$\tilde{g}$	240	330
$\tilde{u}_L, \tilde{d}_L$	235	322
$\tilde{u}_R$	216	297
$\tilde{d}_R$	213	293
$\tilde{t}_1$	180	195
$\tilde{t}_2$	320	410
h	100	105
A	190	310
H	205	320
$H^\pm$	205	325

Figure Captions

- Fig. 1. The total contribution to ϵ_1 as a function of the lightest chargino mass $m_{\chi_1^\pm}$ (upper row) and also as a function of the lightest Higgs boson mass m_h (lower row) for the minimal $SU(5)$ supergravity model. Points between the two horizontal solid lines are allowed at 90% CL.
- Fig. 2. Same as in Fig. 1 except for the no-scale flipped $SU(5)$ supergravity model. The three distinct curves (from lowest to highest) correspond to $m_t = 100, 130, 160$ GeV.
- Fig. 3. The total contribution to ϵ_2 as a function of the lightest chargino mass $m_{\chi_1^\pm}$ (upper row) and also as a function of the lightest Higgs boson mass m_h (lower row) for the minimal $SU(5)$ supergravity model. Points between the two horizontal solid lines are allowed at 90% CL.
- Fig. 4. Same as in Fig. 3 except for the no-scale flipped $SU(5)$ supergravity model.
- Fig. 5. The total contribution to ϵ_3 as a function of the lightest chargino mass $m_{\chi_1^\pm}$ (upper row) and also as a function of the lightest Higgs boson mass m_h (lower row) for the minimal $SU(5)$ supergravity model. Points between the two horizontal solid lines are allowed at 90% CL.
- Fig. 6. Same as in Fig. 5 except for the no-scale flipped $SU(5)$ supergravity model.